

E 340
.C15 C2
Copy 1

THE CALHOUN TEXT BOOK,

"The great popular party is rallied almost EN MASSE around the banner that is leading the party to its final triumph. The few that still flag will soon be rallied under its ample folds. On that banner is inscribed—FREE TRADE; LOW DUTIES; NO DEBT; SEPARATION FROM BANKS; ECONOMY; RETRENCHMENT; AND STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE CONSTITUTION.' Victory in such a cause will be great and glorious; and if its principles be faithfully & firmly adhered to, after it is achieved, much will redound to the honor of those

by whom it will have been won; and long will it perpetuate the liberty and prosperity of the country.—CALHOUN.

— OF CONGRESS —
NEW-YORK:
HERALD OFFICE,
PHILADELPHIA:

G. B. ZIEBER & Co., No. 3 LEDGER BUILDINGS.

BOSTON: REDDING & CO. CHARLESTON: BABCOCK & CO;
SAMUEL HART SR. NEW ORLEANS: BRAVO AND MORGAN.
MOBILE: J. M. SUMWALT AND CO.

65 31
101
5340
31502

INTRODUCTION.

The following pages comprise a condensed view of the past Character and Services of the Hon. JOHN C. CALHOUN. The frank, honorable and independent manner, that has ever manifested itself in all his public acts, as well as the spotless purity and integrity of his private life, have endeared him to a large circle of admiring countrymen, which the lenient hand of Time can never rent asunder.

In all the great questions that have agitated the public mind during the past thirty-five years, Mr. Calhoun has taken a prominent and conspicuous part. "He has now retired from the theatre of public life, neither wearied nor worn, but because his work is done, so far at least, as Senatorial life can afford him any useful part to play. If there be any new field of action worthy of his powers, and as yet untrodden by him, it is in that highest executive sphere, for which the character of his mind and the experience of his life have so eminently fitted him. It is, perhaps, only upon this theatre that his countrymen would not now exclaim, "Superfluous lags the veteran on the stage," and it is there that they will probably require him to consummate, as perhaps he alone can do, those great Republican reforms so cherished by the party, as destined to command it to the grateful regards of posterity."

Political opponents jealous of his power, and rampant demagogues envious of his growing popularity, have attempted to cast a gloom over his character and services, but his reputation shall stand upon a sure foundation, a simple majestic structure that envy cannot undermine, nor the meretricious ornaments of party panegyric deform.

Baltimore, November 15th, 1843.

CALHOUN TEXT BOOK.

MR. CALHOUN.

We publish below an article from the New York Journal of Commerce on Mr. CALHOUN, which shows that this able, but temperate press, comprehends the characteristics of this great statesman. We were particularly struck with the remark—"Mr. CALHOUN has never taken any part in arranging elections; he has never had wires to pull, or machinery to manage; but has been a mere spectator, and has always treated his own prospects, when he was a candidate, with less interest than almost any other man has treated them." If we were to judge by certain presses, we would suppose that Mr. CALHOUN was moving heaven and earth to affect the Presidency. But let a man pass through the retired little village of Abbeville, in South Carolina, and ask for Mr. CALHOUN: he will probably learn that he was in the village, at church, on the last Sabbath, and is now at his farm, three miles off. Let him go to visit him. If the day permits, he will find him in his fields, diligently attending to the details of his farm. A hearty welcome and a bright smile, will cheer the visitor; and the great man will only be seen in the kind host and simple gentleman. If he enters the parlor, he may see piles of letters unanswered, and of newspapers unread; but look at that bursting folio: there are his thoughts accumulating for his country. Not on station or honor intent, but shedding from his deep and brilliant mind the results of its long experience in the principles and policy of our Government. There will be his claim to immortality—a claim that official station can neither give nor take away. MILTON, still lives in his mighty thoughts, to bless and improve the world; whilst CHARLES and CROMWELL are only remembered for their question-

able deeds, and the dark tragedies they produced in life's poor drama. His days, he knows, are few; and although the clouds of popular prejudice, raised by that hatred which persecuted even the Saviour of the world, may obscure its setting rays, his glorious sun burns brighter and brighter in the empyrean, as it rushes to its decline; and when it is sunk, men will then wonder, and learn, and love.

MR. CALHOUN.

The political position of this gentleman is, and always has been, peculiar. He has commanded the votes of the whole country at an election, and been chosen by unanimous acclamation Vice President of the United States; yet he never had a party, in the common acceptation of that term. There never has been between him and any set of politicians through the country, any arrangement for mutual support. If he were elected President to-morrow, there would not be a man in the whole country to whom he would owe the least obligation, or who could claim anything of him. Mr. Calhoun has never taken any part in arranging elections; he has never had wires to pull, or machinery to manage, but has been a mere spectator, and has always treated his own prospects when he has been a candidate, with less interest than almost any other man has treated them. His friends have never done much to organize themselves. They were in old times the whole country, and so needed no organization. The support given to Mr. Calhoun has always been, to an unusual extent, the impulse of personal esteem. At home it is so peculiarly. There he mingles not at all with political partisans. From Congress he goes home and busies himself upon his farm, and in his family, and scarcely is seen at all in public until he returns to his official position. He will not conform to the Southern custom of stump canvassing for votes, nor do any thing which looks like seeking for office. He was educated at Yale College, and studied law at Litchfield; yet he has never visited those places since his youthful education was completed, and chiefly because his position has been such, for a series of years, that he could not travel through the country without exposing himself to the charge of seeking for votes. During the whole course of his life, we do not recollect that he has ever been charged with unfaithfulness to any of his engagements of any sort. His political opinions have always been frankly avowed, and when avowed, there has never been any doubt as to what they were, or whether they would be adhered to. He has never waited for public sentiment to be formed before he dared to disclose his own opinions; but whenever a subject has

come before the body to which he belonged, has taken his ground respecting it, and uniformly with so thorough a comprehension of all its bearings, that his opinions have wanted no modification afterwards. In this way he has been much the most consistent of all our leading public men. It is not at all disreputable to any man that he is sometimes in error, nor that when he perceives the truth, he avows the change which his opinions have undergone. It is alledged, we know, that Mr. Calhoun is inconsistent because he advocated the stimulating of American manufactures into existence as a reason for increasing the tariff at one time, and now advocates free trade upon its broadest and most uncompromising principles. Mr. Calhoun himself, in his late letter, seems to allow that his position is not now exactly what it was once, but it seems to us that he made the concession more as a matter of magnanimity, than because it was really demanded by the circumstances. At a time when threatening war was gathering around our infant country, Mr. Calhoun did propose that duties should be advanced some two to five per cent. making them up to fifteen or seventeen per cent. in all, and he gave as one reason for doing so, that it would stimulate manufactures into existence; but he never advocated any other tariff than one of adequate revenue. A man who drinks a glass of wine at the table of his friend, might as well be taunted with inconsistency because he protests against drunkenness in the streets. It is not for us certainly to call this inconsistent, for it is just what we have agreed to. There are modifying circumstances almost always attendant upon the practical application of great principles, and yielding to them in a practical spirit is not a pledge to carry out those modifying circumstances until they become ascendant principles and destroy the fundamental rule. It is true that, as a fundamental principle, trade should be left free altogether, and entirely free; yet it would be anything but practical wisdom to determine that nothing should ever modify this principle in its practical operation.

In his personal character, Mr. Calhoun is a model for statesmen. Amid all the bitterness with which he has been assailed, the purity of his life was never questioned. He professes to make the precepts of the Bible his rule of life, and no one ever questioned the sincerity of his profession. Many men who stood reputably in our churches, have fallen under the temptations of public life, made shipwreck of the faith, become vicious in their personal habits, and unworthy of trust in their political associations. But Mr. Calhoun has never been charged with personal vice or political treachery. Although we do not think that personal piety should be a test for office, yet it is right that Christian men, who have been praying that we may have rulers "who fear God and hate covetousness," should know that Mr. Calhoun is such a man, and

that when he is nominated for office, they have an opportunity, unless his opponent is a similar character, to test the sincerity of their petitions. From our own observation, however, we conclude that most men will vote for their own party.

That Mr. Calhoun is a statesman of the first class, we need not say: and that his plans of policy would secure the peace and quietude of our Union, we are sure every man believes who has attentively considered his course. The agitations of the country have always been caused by strong measures, baring unequally upon the country, and of doubtful constitutionality. The Southern policy of constructing the powers of the Federal Government strictly, and exercising only those which are unquestionably conveyed to Congress, could be as eminently promotive of the prosperity as of the peace and happiness of the country. We need statesmen whose views are national; who do not depend upon blowing the flames of civil war in Rhode Island to please the Democracy, or an expedition against Oregon to please the Western borders, for a protective tariff to please New England, Pennsylvania, and Louisiana, at the expense of justice to all other parts of the country. A wild but expanded policy, securing liberty to every citizen, and imposing necessary burthens equally upon all, is the government which this great country requires. With Mr. Calhoun at the head of affairs, we might expect an efficient, yet benignant, and peaceful administration at home, and a courteous, but dignified policy abroad. The corrupting influence of party arrangements would terminate; the spoils would cease to be divided among hungry scramblers; good men would no longer be proscribed and expelled from office to make room for party sycophants; the low grovelling passions of the vicious would no longer be appealed to, but the patriotism which ought to fill every American bosom.

For ten years past, Mr. Calhoun has been treated with great neglect and illiberality at the North. Both the Whig and Democratic newspapers have united to disparage and misrepresent him.—His splendid speeches have almost never been printed, but caricature sketches given in their place. The friends of other statesmen, however, much opposed to each other, have united in traducing a man whose popularity once overshadowed them, and who being the same man still, would hold the same rank again with his countrymen, if only his course of policy was correctly delineated before them. He is, however, popular as far as correct views are entertained, and we have no doubt, would be again the most beloved statesman of the nation, if his character were but understood through the country as it is in South Carolina. His great popularity there, in the language of Mr. Senator Preston, "is the result of his personal worth. No man becomes acquainted with him who does not love him to the bottom of his heart."

From the New Haven Register.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

The following communication meets and refutes many of the objections urged by the opponents of Mr. CALHOUN:

Messrs. Editors.—However good a Democrat your correspondent, "A Plain Man," may *profess* to be, he seems by his *acts* to be, *in league with the Whigs* in at least one object, and that is, an attempt to *blast* the prospects of one of the distinguished men whom a large portion of the Democratic party have brought forward as a candidate for the Presidential nomination at the Convention to be holden at Baltimore in May next.

We look for and expect ungenerous and unfounded attacks upon each and upon all of the Democratic candidates from our opponents; but when such attacks upon either of the Democratic candidates come from a *professed* friend, it excites our wonder. Certainly this course is not pursued by any *known advocate* of the Democratic cause, when pressing the claims of his favorite to the favorable consideration of his political friends, be his predilections what they may; it becomes our unknown and anonymous and masked writer to do it. Gov. Hubbard, of New Hampshire, whose feelings are decidedly favorable to Mr. Van Buren, speaks of Mr. Calhoun as worthy of any office which Democratic votes can bestow; and the editor of the *Globe*, who also prefers Mr. Van Buren, in his paper of the 19th inst. congratulates the Democracy of the country, when speaking of the proceedings of the Democratic State Convention of Massachusetts, "That nothing in the proceedings tend, in the remotest manner, to disparage other candidates, or prejudice their claims on the party." And if "A Plain Man" is what he pretends to be, he would better promote the cause which he professes to have at heart, to deal out his blows openly, in the broad light of day, in the *face* of his avowed political *enemies*, than to give *stabs* secretly, in the dark, into the backs of his political *friends*. Certainly we shall have work enough at the next Presidential election with our enemies, without quarrelling with our friends.

The statements which "A Plain Man" makes, must be judged by the same rules that would be applied to any other anonymous writer; and it is a safe rule, that when any *unknown* writer in any communication is proved to have made any one statement, known to be *untrue*, that no reliance should be placed upon any thing which he may say; so apply this rule to "A Plain Man:" In speaking of his former support to Mr. Van Buren, he says, "I *did* vote for Martin Van Buren in 1840. I *did* vote for Martin Van Buren in 1836. John C. Calhoun *did not*." When Mr. Van Buren was a candidate in 1840, John C. Calhoun gave to him as

hearty a support as any man in the country; and it was through his exertions that the Democracy were enabled to show even a respectable minority in the Presidential canvass of that year—New York, the home of Mr. Van Buren, went for the Whigs, other States at the North, before then strong in the Democratic faith, were found in the opposition, and yet South Carolina, the home of Mr. Calhoun, remained firm, and while the Northern Democracy yielded to their enemies, gave her entire vote for Mr. Van Buren. This must have been known to “A Plain Man,” and yet knowing this, he says “I (a plain man) *did* vote for Martin Van Buren in 1840. I did vote for Martin Van Buren in 1836. John C. Calhoun *did not*.” After such a statement as this, little reliance should be placed upon any thing that “A Plain Man” may say, whoever he may be.

Mr. Calhoun does not hold himself up for the high office of the Presidency. He is put forward by his political friends, who think that no event could happen that would be so conducive to the prosperity of the country as his election to the Presidential chair. When addressed by the Democratic State Central Committee of Indiana on the subject of his being a candidate, he answered them as a patriotic man should, situated as Mr. Calhoun was. As he does not put himself forward, but his name having been used by his Democratic friends, he is in the hands of those Democratic friends, and they have said that so far as they have a voice in the matter, the decision of a fairly constituted convention at Baltimore shall be binding. That part of Mr. Calhoun’s letter to the Indiana Committee which relates to the subject is as follows: “This question (that put by the Indiana Committee) seems to assume that I am a candidate soliciting the office of President, and determining by my individual judgment the proper measures to be adopted to secure it. It is not the light in which I regard myself, or desire to be regarded by the public. My name has been presented for that high office by no agency or solicitation of mine, and it belongs to the friends who prefer me and have presented my name to the people, to decide upon the course proper to be adopted in reference to that question. I have, however, no reason to doubt, but that they will cheerfully abide by the decision of a convention fairly constituted, that would allow ample time for the full development of public opinion, and would represent fully, equally, and fairly, the voice of the majority of the party.”

What modest, meritorious man, could express himself better than Mr. Calhoun has in the above extract from his letter to the Indiana Committee? He says explicitly, I am not a candidate soliciting the office of President, I do not set myself up for that high office; my name has been mentioned by a portion of the great Democratic party to which we all belong, without any solicitation

on my part, and I entertain no doubt that those of our friends who have used my name for the Presidential nomination, will cheerfully abide by the decision of the convention; and those friends have said they would so abide. What more could "A Plain Man" ask? And yet with all this before him, he appears to seek, by garbled extracts, to pervert the meaning of Mr. Calhoun's letter, and do him as rank injustice as would be done by an open, undisguised Whig.

Equally unjust towards Mr. Calhoun is the attempt of "A Plain Man," to have it appear and believed that Mr. C. attended a dinner given to him by the Whigs in Charleston, in March, 1837, and on that occasion he advocated in a speech the odious distribution law. Mr. Calhoun never was a Whig, and never attended a dinner given by Whigs, unless, in the opinion of "A Plain Man," the States' Rights Democrats of the South, the men who, by their exertions in the battle of 1840, saved the citadel of Democracy from perfect destruction, are Whigs. In 1837, when the public deposits amounted to about forty millions of dollars, all of which were placed in the State banks, how safely, may be judged from the fact that a few months afterwards all the banks blew up, Mr. Calhoun, then being openly in favor of the Independent Treasury, of dissolving the Government from its connection with banks, (Mr. Van Buren was then in favor of the pet bank system,) rather than consent to this money remaining in rotten banks, was in favor of having it deposited with the States. The money was in the Treasury, or rather, deposited in banks. The Sub-Treasury plan had been up before Congress, (Mr. Calhoun being at that time in its favor,) and voted down. Mr. Calhoun was opposed to the money remaining in the banks, and as it could not be deposited in an Independent Treasury, that bill having been defeated as a choice of evils, he was in favor of having it deposited with the States. And at the Charleston dinner, which "A Plain Man" speaks of, the question discussed was, whether the banks should have the money then on hand, or whether it should be deposited with the States. The question of raising money, either by duties on imports, or by the sale of public lands, for the purposes of distribution among the States, Mr. Calhoun has always been opposed to. In a speech delivered in the Senate, on the 23th of February, 1837, in speaking of the distribution scheme, he says he "was the first to denounce such a system, and his opinion on this point had undergone no change whatever;" and in his speech on the bill to distribute the proceeds of the public lands, delivered in the Senate, January 22, 1841, he says: "It has, sir, been my fortune to be opposed to the scheme from the beginning. It originated with a former member of this body, Mr. Dickinson, of New Jersey, and recently Secretary of the Navy, as far back as the year

1827. His professed object was to strengthen the protective tariff interest, by distributing a part of its proceeds annually among the States, in the manner proposed by the amendment. I took my stand against it promptly and decidedly, in its first agitation, as a measure dangerous and unconstitutional."

And no one but "A Plain Man" ever denied this. His early opposition to the scheme of distribution was the first cause of the temporary alienation between him and General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren. The President at the first session of the 26th Congress, when Mr. Van Buren was Secretary of State, and also at the second session, had recommended distribution; Mr. Calhoun, in his speech last referred to, says: "I saw the danger in its full extent, and did not hesitate to take an open and decided stand against the measure which he (the President) so earnestly recommended: and that was the first question on which we separated." He, in 1830 and 1831, separated from General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren for a time. They were then in favor of distribution and he against it; as in his opinion it was "a measure dangerous and unconstitutional." And now, that Democratic sentiment has been made right on this subject, and the "sober second thought" prevails, both Gen. Jackson and Mr. Van Buren admit, that they in recommending distribution at that time, were *wrong*, and that Mr. Calhoun in opposing it was *right*. And if Democrats are true to their principles, and regard the great doctrines which have now become the cardinal tenets of the Democratic creed, they must feel that they owe a debt of gratitude to John C. Calhoun for the stand he took and the efforts he displayed in restoring and establishing them, which can never be repaid but by his election at some future period to the high office of President of the United States.

JEFFERSON.

From the Fredericksburg (Va.) Recorder.

PROTECTION.

We wish the Democratic press would continue to hammer away upon the present iniquitous Tariff. It must be repealed, or our boasted equality is nothing but a gross and palpable humbug. Our neighbor does not choose to see "any good grounds of attack upon the 'Tariff,'" in the recent "*strikes*" of workmen, journeymen tailors, and others, in Boston. We see many "grounds for attack." No part of the present system is more onerous than that in relation to woollens and lady-made clothing. Hence we might suppose those engaged in the manufacture of clothes, would grow rich in a hurry. And so they will; we mean the large dealers. A monopoly is granted them, and they forthwith in Boston, avail themselves of its immunities, form a "conspiracy" to regulate the price of clothing, and the rate of wages, which, as appeared by

the testimony, were so low that a man could only earn from *three to five dollars a week*, by working day and night. And is it for this “\$3 to \$5 a week” that the laboring classes of New England sell themselves to the protective party! And they will find, as they have found, that each step of this fictitious system is upon their necks; that each acquisition of power, is a power to bind them; and that the rivalry very soon will be between “the pauper labor of Europe” and *pauper labor of America*.

From the Charleston Mercury.

SPEECH OF THE HON. WM. SMITH, OF VA.

At a public meeting recently given to the Hon. Wm. SMITH, late member of Congress, by his constituents, that gentleman delivered a speech abounding in sensible and liberal views of political subjects, from which we extract so much as relates to the pending Presidential controversy in the Democratic party, and request for it the attention that its good sense and liberal spirit deserve.

Fellow Citizens—I now approach a subject with much reluctance, of general interest, and destined I fear, to become soon, an absorbing one; upon which I dislike to speak, and yet cannot be altogether silent. I allude to the question of who is to be the Democratic candidate for the Presidency at the approaching election, and how and when he is to be selected. Many of my late constituents have honored me with inquiries on this subject; and I shall therefore, briefly present some of the views which early occurred to my mind, with that diffidence of my own, and respect for the opinions of others, which its interesting character is so well calculated to inspire.

With those of my fellow citizens who know my private circumstances, and have observed my public conduct, it will readily be granted, that no man has more freely and zealously sustained the Republican party than myself. “Every thing for measures and nothing for men,” has been my motto. In this spirit, early in the past winter, before these subjects had been agitated to any considerable extent, certainly before any serious feeling had been aroused, I addressed several valued friends on the subject of our candidate, and the time and manner of his selection. I knew that a real heartfelt spirit of conciliation, was indispensable in the preservation of harmony; and that whatever was done thereto, should be done with promptness and cordiality. I saw among our public men, many aspirants for the Presidency—Some with growing fortunes. They, I knew, would be for the latest period of holding the Convention, because each would flatter himself, that time alone was wanting to establish his strength and secure his nomination.

To refuse the fullest time at all allowable to the action of public opinion, would be denounced with much effect as wrong in principle—offensive to the just and reasonable claims of friends; and indicative of a growing change in the public mind, averse to those making the objection, while it could not fail to excite a degree of irritation altogether incompatible with that harmony, without which our strength is but weakness. I knew, moreover, that the minority interests in our party would combine upon this subject, and prove too strong to be controlled. And I laid down as principles, that whatever any considerable portion of our party required, if not unfair, should be yielded without a word, merely because required; and that what it was obvious must ultimately be conceded, ought to be conceded with alacrity, to win the good will which always attends manly and liberal conduct. And I, therefore, early avowed myself in favor of the latest period named. Other councils, however, prevailed in Virginia, and an early day was designated by our Convention. But, as I was satisfied would come to pass, we have been compelled to retrace our steps, and agree to the latest day, not only without thanks for our liberality, but with imputations upon our fair dealing; and what is more to be deplored, with many of our friends chafed and irritated at our conduct.

The day of holding the Convention having been agreed upon, the manner of organizing that body, next pressed itself upon our consideration. Upon this subject, I also early formed my opinion, which has remained unchanged, and which I will cheerfully give you.

This subject, you are aware, has been much discussed, I confess I have been no little surprised at some of the views which have been expressed. What is the object of the intended Convention? Is it not to ascertain the man who is the choice of a majority of the Republican party, that we may all unite upon him as our candidate for the Presidency? We have now in the United States two millions of Republican voters. Who is the choice of a majority of them, is alone the question. And to solve this question, and this alone, it seems to me is the great duty of the proposed Convention. But for the difference in the elective test, in the several States of our Union, and the existing institution of slavery among us, we should select our candidate by a direct vote of the people at the polls. But, as this is impossible, the nearest approach to it is, in my opinion, the next best, most popular and most truly Republican mode; and that is, the election of a delegate from each Congressional district, to vote in Convention as members of Congress do, each, according to his preference and opinion. A Convention thus formed, will prove sufficiently numerous for all practical purposes, will, as nearly as may be, and I doubt, not truly, represent the Republican party, and will, in my judgment, alone

given satisfaction. Our Convention of last winter, recommended the election of four delegates from each Congressional district, the body thus elected, to cast the vote of the State as may be thought best. This arrangement, I can but think is deficient in principle, altogether wrong, and calculated to surrender the vote of Virginia to irresponsible management. Those who look to the Constitution as furnishing analogies for embodying the Convention, admit, (and it is unquestionably true,) that under the Constitution, a minority of the people may elect the President. But will any one be so hardy as to insist that a minority of the Republican party, ought to select our candidate? or, that it is not our burden duty, as far as possible, to present such a result? With what propriety, then, can such refer to the Constitution for authority or precedent? I also object to the addition of two delegates from each State, in addition to those elected from districts, from analogy to the Senators, to which each State is entitled by the Constitution. This will give to the small States an undue preponderance in the selection, which should rest upon the popular principle alone. Nor can I see the wisdom of referring to the analogies or authority of the Constitution, in any respect. That instrument, original, unique, profound in conception, and yet the child of compromise, exhibits its wisdom, its utility, and its power, by its numerous restraints upon numerical majorities. The House of Representatives may pass a bill, and the Senate may reject it. Both may pass it, and yet it may die beneath the Executive veto. Again: a large majority of the American people, may desire a change in the Constitution; and yet that change cannot be had without the concurrence of 19 of the 26 States of our Union. But by a Convention, our purpose is to ascertain the wish of a popular majority, to give it full and true expression, and in no degree to throw restraints about it. I therefore, cannot, for the life of me, see the propriety of any reference to the Constitution. I must insist, it furnishes neither principle nor analogy to guide us in the organization of the proposed Convention.

I have thus, my friends, expressed myself candidly yet earnestly, upon these subjects; and with the more earnestness, because I really fear, without both are conceded, the most fatal consequences will ensue. And I have done it with the greatest freedom; for, whatever course may be determined on, my conduct, in the approaching struggle, will be precisely the same. Would to God, the Republican party would, with one voice, proclaim the district system, with the per capita vote, and thus hush the clamors of discontent, and crush the hopes of Federalism. Who, who, willing to be controlled by a majority, could complain of, or suffer by it?

Having thus, fellow-citizens, presented you my views upon the two engrossing topics of the day, I will venture my opinion, as to

the man who will likely receive our nomination. I entertain not the shadow of a doubt, that Mr. Van Buren is this day stronger with the Republican party, than any one of all our candidates.— But is he stronger than all combined? It is a well known property of our nature, eagerly to believe whatever is pleasing or desirable to us. And hence it may be expected, that the friends of all our aspirants, will readily conclude, as Mr. Van Buren has once had the honor of the Presidency, and received the vigorous support of the Democratic party for a second term, that all the requirements of party obligation have been fully answered, and that he should no longer be in the way of those, whose aspirations advancing age will not permit much longer to be delayed. Hence, in Convention, Mr. Van Buren will have to encounter, in all probability, the united opposition of all his competitors. Can he successfully do it? I doubt it. And thus, in my opinion, the chances are in favor of Mr. Calhoun, on whom, or Mr. Van Buren, the nomination will, I doubt not, be conferred. In this aspect, it is of the first importance to those gentlemen, that the most friendly relations should be preserved between them and their respective friends. Temperance, conciliation and forbearance, should be sedulously cultivated. But, above all, it should never be forgotten, that reciprocal attacks can add no strength to either.

In expressing this opinion, as to the chances of the nomination, let no one suppose it to be the consequence of any preference of men—that preference, if any, lies in my own bosom, and has never been avowed. And deeply do I regret, that our leading journals, and prominent public men, had not adopted a similar policy, and left to the masses, freed from all active agencies, the selection of a candidate, through delegates appointed, without special commitment, and only instructed so to act as to give the most general satisfaction, and to promote the Republican policy of the country. My purpose was, and still is, to take no part in the struggle between friends. It would be to me a part most painful and ungracious, repugnant to my whole nature, and will never be taken by me, except in some unexpected extremity. No, men of Madison, with the strife which is brewing, I will have no agency. Of the calamitous consequences that may result from it, I wash my hands. I have ever regarded men as that dust in the balance, when weighed against the disasters of Republican defeat. For the eminent abilities, and Roman firmness of Martin Van Buren, I entertain the highest regard. My appreciation of him is to be found in the labors and the sacrifices of the past—and if the future shall be to me, I will not be found wanting. Of the great South Carolinian, I have but little to say. His mighty intellect—that to the stranger may appear stern, grand, and peculiar—is softened and relieved by a kind and gentle spirit, which mingles in most happy combina-

tion in the bosoms of his friends, admiration for his mind, and affection for his person. "But I will not praise him." Would I seek the promotion of either to the Presidency, at the risque even of our defeat? Surely not, "Every thing for measures, and nothing for men, has ever been the governing principle of my political conduct, and will, I trust, continue to control me, until time to me shall be no more. And if, indeed, we shall be weak enough to quarrel and divide, and so fall a prey to our adversaries, I shall enjoy the consolation, poor though it be, of knowing that I am not responsible for the ruin of our hopes, and the calamities of our overthrow; but that I did all in my feeble power, by precept and example, to pass this cup from our lips.

From the Washington Spectator.

MR. CALHOUN.

The following brief, but truthful and discriminating, notice of Mr. Calhoun's character and talents, is taken from an article in the October number of Hunt's Merchants' Magazine, on the "History of the Chartering of the United States Bank, by Francis Wharton, of Philadelphia." The writer, with prophetic vision, anticipates the verdict that will be passed upon Mr. Calhoun and his labors, when the men and the parties of the present day, and the feelings and prejudices to which they have given rise, shall have passed away :

"On Mr. Calhoun, as the Chairman of the Bank Committee, did the duty devolve of presenting the charter to the House, and supporting it, after it was presented. Mr. Calhoun, though not much beyond thirty years of age, had been present, and had taken an active part in the House during the two preceding sessions, and from his great ability, his boldness, his freedom from those points of offence which so often detract from the power of a preliminary leader, he had been hit upon by the administration as its organ, not only upon the Bank question, but upon most of the remaining points to which the attention of Congress was directed. We cannot but regret that so imperfect a record should remain of speeches uttered at a period so critical by a man, whose efforts, under any circumstances, deserve study as much as they provoke admiration. Mr. Calhoun has now withdrawn from Congressional life; and as the curtain has dropped finally the scene of his great efforts, we feel that it is not unsuitable for us to rest for a moment to contemplate a career which is one of the most remarkable in history.—Not endowed with those distinctive characteristics which made one of great rivals the most eloquent declaimer of the day, and the

other its most powerful debater, we question whether in the sphere which he had laid open to himself—the sphere of political argumentation, he has ever been equalled. Fastening his mind firmly on the point he is to make, and approaching it with an energy which never faints, and with an ability which never wavers, the strict line of demonstration is pursued with a vigor almost painful in its intensity, and which insures in the mind of the student, submission to the correctness of the reasoning, if not conviction of the truth of the conclusion. It would have been better, if immediate effect was sought for, to have given the traveller resting places, where he could have stopped occasionally to divert his attention from the strict line of deduction, and to enable him to cheer the orator onwards during the period of mutual relaxation. If Mr. Calhoun's speeches had been framed for the single purpose of parliamentary triumph, we doubt not that the usual little episodes of retort, or of story telling, by which the attention of his hearers, refreshed by the parenthesis thus created, might have been more completely won, could have been successfully introduced. But it must be remembered that the neglect of imagery, the freedom from personal controversy, the absence of appeals to the personal taste, or the political prejudices of his hearers, the utter disuse of the engines of ridicule or sarcasm—it must be remembered, we say, that the freedom from unnecessary digression, and the earnest rigor with which the argument is pursued, tends to heighten, in the mind of the student, the convictions which the power of the reasoning produces. We are sensible that we have been worked upon by no inferior appeals to our personal tastes of party associations, and that neither our sense of the ridiculous, nor our sense of the sublime, has been tampered with, in order that our reason should be betrayed. It must have been impossible to have listened to Mr. Webster's wonderful speeches during the debate on Mr. Foot's resolution—it certainly is impossible to study them as reported—without rising with a deep sense of admiration for the splendid qualities which have there been introduced into action. We are carried away by impetuous eloquence there displayed—the Mohawk onslaught as Mr. Randolph called it—and we feel that same enthusiasm which we feel when we witness the Italian campaigns of Napoleon. We are made partisans at once by the fearlessness of the attack: and as we witness the guns of the enemy turned against himself—as we observe the most fearful odds overcome, and see the weakest points in the whole field chosen, almost because they are the weakest, and then made impregnable, we enter into the conflict instinctively, without knowing any thing more than that we are enrolled under the standard of the eagle, and we take part in the triumphal procession without feeling clear whether we are celebrating anything more than the personal triumph of the

chief. There are many who cannot read Mr. Webster's replies to Mr. Hayne without being thrilled with enthusiasm, and yet who, were they asked what conclusions had been left on their mind, would answer like the grandfather in Southey's poem on the battle of Blenheim,—

“Why that I cannot tell,” said he:
But 'twas a famous victory.

If the feeling of personal sympathy are called less frequently into play by Mr. Calhoun, it cannot be denied that the deficiency thus created is amply compensated by the interest which the argument itself arouses. There is passion it is true, but it is so well trained and kept under, that we observe it like the steam in a well regulated engine, rather in the methodical and rapid action of the machinery it influences, than in the wreaths and puffs of vapor which occasionally escape. There are no intervals for us to stop and cheer; there are no resting places by which we can get out for refreshment; but we are carried onward in a line mathematically straight to the place of destination. It is in this very freedom from digressions of all kinds that Mr. Calhoun's title to the admiration of posterity will in a great degree rest; and we have no doubt that in future periods, when local illusions and personal retort have lost their effect, when the reader seeks to trace out not so much the private skirmishes of statesmen themselves, as the general character of the measures about which they struggled—the chaste and beautiful argumentation which distinguished him, will place him on a level with the few great minds who have been able to instruct the reason, without stooping to please the fancy.

MR. VAN BUREN AND HIS FRIENDS.

It is exceedingly painful to us, to be obliged to admit that there appears to exist, in some sections of the Union, among the friends of Mr. Van Buren, so great a jealousy of the growing popularity of Mr. Calhoun, as to cause them to forget that “measures not men” is the cardinal rule of our party. Now, though we have hoisted the Calhoun banner, and are willing and prepared to do honest battle in his behalf—yet we repudiate the idea, that we are moved thereto by any other than an honest and sincere desire to promote the interests of the country. In our first number we gave our reasons for preferring Mr. Calhoun to any and all of the prominent men of our party, as the candidate for the next Presidency. And while we believe that upon the score of past “past services,” disinterested patriotism, and thorough acquaintance with politics and political economy, he may safely compare notes with any one of the *distinguished many*—still we are not prepared to admit that he is the “*sine qua non*” with us. An honest, faithful, and pa-

triotic discharge of the trusts reposed in public men, should, and will always, be remembered and acknowledged ; but we deny that, in fact, even these can or do create a controlling *lien* in favor of the servant upon the people. We have been induced to these remarks by the course adopted by the friends of Mr. Van Buren.— They seem to think that he has *claims* upon the Democratic party, which cannot be discharged, short of his election to the Presidential chair. *Claims upon the party!* Now, in the name of all that is just, we ask who is so largely indebted to that same party as Mr. Van Buren? Has not “his utmost ambition” been satisfied and gratified by it—has he not, in every trying time of his political career, been sustained by the concentrated power of the party? When reflections were made upon his character as a man, and his capacity as a statesman, by his recall as minister from the Court of St. James, did not the party itself become the defender of his wrongs, and by his elevation to the Vice Presidency, so effectually redress his injurier, as to force from himself the exclamation “*it is glory enough?*” Who, we ask, rallied around him in the contest of 1836? who sustained his administration? who nominated him for re-election in 1840, and who, in that dark hour for the country, stood manfully up to him, and for him, and *fell with him?*—need we answer—the Democratic party. And yet his *peculiar* friends say he has *claims* upon the party and seem determined to connect the success of the party and the interests of the country inseparably with the fate of the man Van Buren. Now, according to this kind of *logic*, and the views of the Van Burenites, we suppose the Democrats are so deeply indebted to, and so entirely dependent upon, *Martin*, that we must continue to run him, until he shall be elected Chief Magistrate, or the party annihilated. Well, if this be the alternative, we seriously fear that the country has already witnessed the last Democratic Presidential triumph which history will ever record.

These remarks and this conclusion, so painful to us, are not suggested by any unkind feelings towards Mr. Van Buren or his zealous friends. We have battled for him, with all our energies and ability in days gone by. We yet believe him to be a sterling Democrat, patriot and statesman, and should he be the candidate of the party, will again give him hearty support. But we deny that Mr. Van Buren has *claims* upon the party. In a Republic like ours, great men may be called, as was Cincinnatus by the Romans, to fill, but have no claims to, nor right to demand office.

[*Chambers (Ala.) Herald.*

MR. CALHOUN.

We extract the following article from the April No. (1843) of the Southern Quarterly Review. It forms the concluding portion of a very elaborate and excellent review of the life of that distinguished statesman supposed to be from the pen of the Hon. R. M. T. Hunter, of Va., and recently published by the Messrs. Harper and Brothers, of New York.

“Mr. Calhoun is about to run a great race in which kings, or what are better than kings—in which great men are to be his antagonists. It was right, therefore, that we should have had such a sketch of his life and actions as now lies before us. Mr. Clay’s Life, Col. Johnson’s, and, we believe, biographies of the other leading candidates for the Presidency, have been recently published. When Mr. Van Buren was canvassing for that high office before, his Life had preceded him, and been sown broad-cast through the land. Had the friends of Mr. Calhoun neglected to pursue a similar course with respect to their candidate, might not the people well have wondered at their silence? But, independently of all party considerations, the life and actions of this great statesman belong to his country. The United States, in whose cause and for whose advancement he has labored so long and so nobly, and which are proud of his talents, his virtues and his fame, are interested—deeply interested in seeing that justice is done to his merits. He is no common man. Few such individuals are produced in an age or in the course of ages. Endowed with the highest reach of intellect, profoundly versed in political affairs as they extend back nearly to the origin of our government, his life may be said to be identified with the history of free institutions in America, and by the light and beauty beaming from it, to have shed lustre, grace and glory upon the American character. A finished scholar, who, in early life, devoted himself to learning, as to a mistress, and attained to the highest literary honors in one of the first colleges in the Union—a philosopher, in the best sense of the word,—not one who skims the surface of things, but who has searched into causes, has ascended to principles and viewed them in their multiplied relations and varied bearings upon life, customs and institutions;—an accomplished agriculturist, skilled in that first of all sciences, the successful culture of the soil, the great source of a nation’s wealth and influence both at home and abroad;—a proficient in the theory, if not the practice, of various mechanical arts;—intimately acquainted, from the office he once filled, with the great science of war;—a steady and devoted friend to the commercial and the manufacturing interests of the country;—an orator of most commanding eloquence,—a complete mas-

ter of the English tongue, powerful in producing conviction, not by moving the passions, but by the force of reason and of facts;—a courteous gentleman, free in his intercourse with all classes, and ready and able, from the stores of a richly furnished mind, to impart light on almost all subjects interesting to his race;—a man of inflexible integrity and unblemished purity of character, commanding universal confidence by his acknowledged and unshrinking honesty of purpose on all occasions;—such an individual, notwithstanding the jealousy of partizans and the envy of rivals, is an honor to human nature itself, which he has raised and ennobled. He represents the intellectual power and superior attributes of a free people. American literature points with pride to the laurels he has acquired as a scholar, an orator, and a statesman, which place him on the vantage ground, when compared with the intellectual and illustrious men of former times and of other countries. Upon such an individual, office, although it be the highest within a people's gift, confers no additional honor, but is itself illustrated and adorned by such an organ of popular will. If he do not attain the highest distinction, it will not be because the North, the South, the East and the West are indifferent to his merits.—It will not be, because the American people lack discernment, or because they are ungrateful to a public benefactor, whose long and brilliant life has been spent in their service, and devoted to the cause of his country—the cause of liberty and of human happiness. It will only be, because he is not the only great man whom America has produced, who is fitted, by his virtues, his talents and his patriotism, to occupy the highest station of trust in the land,—because he is not the only man who is able to maintain the honor of our free institutions, and to carry his country forward in the path of fame and glory upon which she has entered.

From the Charleston Mercury.

THE SUB-TREASURY.

We have already taken occasion to bring to notice the claim which had been made at the New York meeting, for credit to Mr. Van Buren of the authorship of the Sub Treasury system. We propose now, to prove by contemporaneous "sayings and doings," that all that was then stated is true, and that as all the blame in time past has been laid at the door of Mr. Calhoun, for the origin of this system, it is but common justice to give him the benefit of the good opinion of all who are now favorable to its author. In the year 1834, it will be remembered, the division of opinion in the country was most remarkable. Parties had not then assumed the positions they now occupy. An active opposition was organized against the Administration. The stern will of Gen. Jackson had levelled the Bank of the United States. Mr. Rives, in the

Senate of the United States, was the able and ingenious advocate of the State Banks—and Mr. Webster stood forth the chief and head of those who looked to the re-establishment of the Bank of the United States as the panacea for the ills with which the country was afflicted. The removal of the public deposits, was itself an act, well calculated to paralyze the public mind, and even they who were the leaders and counsellors, seemed hesitating and afraid what course to advise—what policy to adopt in this unexpected conjuncture.

In a speech delivered by Mr. Calhoun at that session—we mean the session of 1834—a speech characterized by the most profound and searching reflections on the monetary concerns of the country, his opinions on these vexed but most important questions are given with the utmost clearness. The proposition that was so warmly advocated by Mr. Rives and his party, and which had for its object, the fostering of State Banks in place of the United States Bank, was discussed in the ablest manner. The injury that would result to the Government—to the States—to individuals—the insecurity that must attach to these institutions as depositories of the public funds, the wrong that would be inevitably done to them in the selection—the baneful influences that would be brought to operate on the country at large, the impossibility of having a fixed value in their exchanges—or if fixed, the untruth and injustice that would result from the arbitrary establishment of such a value, were all exhibited in a light so strong, as to penetrate the veil which had been hung before the scheme and affrighted those who had been loudest in its support.

In regard to the question of the United States Bank, the same clear and positive views are expressed. It was here that the true issue was to be presented. All other propositions were but secondary—mere palliatives—excuses for not doing something more. In all times of great public danger, the weak fear the strong measure, with which alone permanent good can be effected. Measures for the moment are to such the most agreeable, because in these is less of danger and responsibility. But as to the sick man, violent medicines are in most cases alone useful, so in State policy it often happens that the greatest injury results from the want of decision.

This was then the state of the public mind. Not only out of Congress, but in that body itself. Not only was the right treatment to be prescribed, but in addition to the intrinsic difficulty of the question, the feelings of rival parties were adding additional darkness, to a prospect already hung with a cloud as portentous as that which precedes the storm. Not only was the sick to be healed, but he was first to be rescued from a host of doctors, who would rather gather around his dead body, than admit his restora-

tion to be the work of other hands than their own. Whether a Bank of the United States was the proper remedy, was a matter of great doubt. Whether it was a remedy permitted under the constitution, was a question made but little more certain from its numberless discussions. But yet the objections to it were many and important. And not the least of these was, that its recognition at that crisis would be not only the evidence of its usefulness, but the confession of its indispensable necessity, and the acknowledgment of its final triumph over the wishes and will of the Executive.

Here then, there could be no safety. To be secure, we must travel further. And in elevating himself above the differences of those who were around him—in refusing to be a party in the dispute between matters of unworthy difference—in lifting himself above the noise and confusion of the struggle for power and plunder, then convulsing all; is to be attributed the conclusion that he then so forcibly announced, that there must be a *divorce* between Bank and State. It was not the suggestion of idleness—it was not a conceit, that first then occupied his mind. It was the calm and deliberate result of the most anxious deliberation over the downward fortunes of his country. Nor was it an ephemeral display of an ingenious and plausible theory that dazzled, though it deluded, and after a short period would die away and be hurled in the tide of time. Far otherwise. It was a proposition deliberately matured, and after having passed the ordeal of the severest scrutiny, after having been trampled in the dust, in the mad irruption of passion in the election of Gen. Harrison, again it has risen from the earth—stronger from the load with which it was oppressed—adopted by general acclamation as a great measure of deliverance and liberty, and conferring immortal honor on him who first gave it being.

In his speech delivered in the Senate of the United States in 1834, Mr. Calhoun used this language:

“If, (said he) this was a question of Bank or no Bank—if it involved the existence of the Banking system, it would indeed be a great question—one of the first magnitude, and with my present impression long entertained and daily increasing, I would hesitate—long hesitate, before I would be found under the banner of the system. I have great doubts, if doubts they may be called, as to the soundness and tendency of the whole system in all its modifications. I have great fears that it will be found hostile to liberty, and the advance of civilization; fatally hostile to liberty in our country, where the system exists in its worst and most dangerous form. Of all institutions affecting the great question of the distribution of wealth—a question least explored and the most important of any in the whole range of political economy—the

banking institution has, if not the greatest, one of the greatest, and I fear most pernicious influence on the mode of distribution." * *

"So long as the question is one between a Bank of the United States incorporated by Congress, and that system of Banks which has been created by the will of the Executive, it is an insult to the understanding to discourse on the pernicious tendency and unconstitutionality of the Bank of the United States. To bring up that question fairly and legitimately, you must go one step farther. You must *divorce* the Government and the Banking system. You must refuse all connection with Banks. You must neither receive nor pay away bank notes: you must go back to the old system of the strong box and of gold and silver. If you have a right to receive notes at all—to treat them as money by receiving them in your dues or paying them away to creditors, you have a right to create a Bank." *"I repeat, you must divorce the Government entirely from the Banking system, or if not, you are bound to incorporate a Bank as the only safe and efficient means of giving stability and uniformity to the currency. And should the Deposites not be restored, and the present illegal and unconstitutional connection between the Executive and the league of Banks continue,—I shall feel it my duty, if no one else moves, to introduce a measure prohibiting the Government from receiving or touching bank notes in any shape whatever, as the only means left of giving safety and stability to the currency, and saving the country from corruption and ruin."*

This was the year 1834—THREE years before the policy plainly expressed by Mr. Calhoun was, in *general* terms, recommended to Congress by the Message of Mr. Van Buren—and in some particulars digested by the friends of that gentleman in Congress. And in no speech or message of Mr. Van Buren previous to that time, can there be found a suggestion, which, by any process of political chemistry could be so analyzed as to present the distinct proposition thus announced by Mr. Calhoun in 1834. Nor was it here that the connection between Mr. Calhoun and this measure ended. When the general recommendation of the Federal Executive had to be moulded into the form of legislative enactment, without his jealous scrutiny what would it have been worth? What is the Sub-Treasury system, without the Specie clause? What gives it life but this? What else has recommended it to the serious and reflecting people of our land? And to whom are we indebted for this provision?

It is no small compliment that is paid to Mr. Calhoun, when the friends of Mr. Van Buren are forced to recommend him to the people, by those measures which are identified with the name of Mr. Calhoun, and which of themselves make up the chain by which posterity is already connected with him. Too often it happens that the pilot whose skill and courage have brought the ship

safely to port, is the least heeded of all who were on board. And more than once, in fable and history, has the achievement been with one—the glory with another. We ask no concession from Mr. Van Buren, and would not rob him of the honor of a single act in his political history. But we ask the same for Mr. Calhoun. He has won the prize, let him wear it. If in the comparison which truth will draw between Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Van Buren in this matter, the latter may not appear in so strong a light, let it be remembered, that we have not said a word in derogation of Mr. Van Buren, until his friends were pleased to exhibit him in attire which did not become him, and to which he had no right. We have no motive but to do justice—no object but the truth.

From the Globe.

THE NEXT PRESIDENCY.

MR. CALHOUN—HIS PRINCIPLES.

NO. I.

It seems to have become a settled conviction, at least among the Democrats themselves, that a zealous, harmonious, and concerted action, on their part, would secure to the country a Democratic administration of the Government, during the next Presidential term. To all, then, who believe—as from our inmost soul we do—that the Democratic cause is the cause of liberty, of patriotism, and humanity, the proper selection of their candidate by the Democratic party, becomes a consideration of deep and absorbing interest.

Though ourself but a private in the ranks of Democracy, we have enlisted for the war; and feel that we are, and of right ought to be, entitled to a voice in the choice of our chief.

We propose, then, to present to our brothers of the "rank and file" (for them, more particularly we write) some of the reasons which have contributed to bring our own mind to a conclusion on this important subject. So thoroughly have these reasons convinced us, that we cannot but think they may have their effect on others.

Our choice is the late distinguished Senator from South Carolina, JOHN C. CALHOUN. Prominently as his name has already been presented to the people of the United States, and identified as is his history with that of his country, for the last thirty years, we should consider this a work (as perhaps, our readers will, at any rate, do) of supererogation, but for the fact that most of the friends of Mr. Calhoun have thus far, we think, advocated his cause with an injudicious and somewhat intolerant zeal, more calculated to provoke opposition than to conciliate. Such a course

is, perhaps, inseparable from the position of an active partisan; and has been, we fear, by no means confined to the advocates of Mr. Calhoun. The anxious interest which we feel for their success renders us, however, more alive to any false move on their part.

Withdrawn, as is the writer of this article, from all active participation in politics—neither holding office, nor seeking it—not editing a paper, and only occasionally, indeed; reading one—the views presented have at least the merit of being dispassionately formed, and honestly given.

The considerations which should control the selection of the nominating convention, it will not be disputed, are mainly these two, viz:

1st. The fitness of the nominee.

2d. His availability.

To constitute "fitness," we want a man sound in the Democratic faith, and one whose talents and character are such as to afford a guaranty that, if elected, he will, in the administration of the high office to which we propose to elevate him, add new lustre to his faith by his works. The creed of the party is, perhaps, most concisely expressed in Mr. Calhoun's pithy enumeration, viz: "Free trade; low duties; no debts; separation from banks; economy, retrenchment; and a strict adherence to the Constitution."

Whoever departs from this standard, just in so far as he departs, is not pure in the faith.

Mr. Calhoun's present profession, subjected to this test, is, then, indisputable orthodox. He is objected to, however, on the ground of change and inconsistency.

Admit that, during the first ten of the thirty years of Mr. Calhoun's political life; he said and did many things not reconcilable with his present well-known views and opinions, and what does it prove, but that omniscience belongs to God alone? In Him only do we find no change, or shadow of turning. The views, judgments, and opinions of the most gifted of created beings, must, in the nature of things, be more or less modified by the circumstances which surround them. It is surprising that Mr. Calhoun, entering, as he did, into the counsels of his country when she was on the eve of a war with the most powerful nation of the earth—menaced from without, and torn by faction within—himself young, ardent, enthusiastic—should, as the zealous and leading advocate of that war during its continuance, and the temporary exhaustion which followed it, have looked with a more favorable eye upon an extension of the powers of the Government, than he has done since his wisdom has been matured by increase of years, varied experience, and a further observation of the undisturbed working of our complicated system during a long period of peace?

His public life has been well divided into two epochs—the first, when, in his youthful prime, he gallantly led the van in defending his country from foreign aggression; the second, when, in the maturity of his manhood, he threw himself in the breach, to protect her from domestic usurpation. It will be remembered, too, that during the former period it was the Federalists—the war party in peace, and the peace party in war—who were the strict constructionists, using their every effort to weaken our Government; and that the Republicans, in vindicating their country's honor, were thrown into necessary opposition. Mr. Calhoun has been, in both epochs, engaged in the defence of the same citadel from the same enemy, but from very different points of attack.

He would have been more or less than man, who, under such contrariety of circumstances, could have preserved an entire and thorough consistency. Instead of demanding a miracle, we should rather feel astonishment that, in thirty-two years of active political life, during which Mr. Calhoun has stood prominently forth on every leading measure, there should be so little which, even with his present experience, he need look back to with regret. After all has been said, the only practical purpose on account of which we need inquire into a statesman's past views, is to enable us the better to determine upon the honesty and permanence of his present.

Now, of that sort of consistency which inspires confidence in the honesty of his intentions, what public man has ever exhibited more than John C. Calhoun? And we venture the assertion, that no reader capable of understanding him can examine the volume of Mr. Calhoun's speeches lately published, which contains his views upon every leading measure for the last eighteen years, without perceiving a gradual development of principles in beautiful keeping with each other, and forming a systematic and symmetrical whole, more perfect, perhaps, than is exhibited in the works of any living writer. The earlier speeches are inconsistent with the later, only as the first book of Euclid is with those which succeed, viz: because truth is not followed out quite so far.

But when have the alleged changes in John C. Calhoun taken place? At times when he might expect that "thrift would follow fawning?"

Was it because the tariff State of Pennsylvania had just before nominated him to the Presidency, that his friends in South Carolina took such strong ground against a tariff of protection in 1823 and 1824? Did free trade principles continue so much in the ascendant in the United States from that period to 1828, as to subject him to the suspicion of pretending a zeal he did not feel? Or was his position at this time so humble as to make it his interest to seek rather a sectional than a national popularity? Was his nul-

lification remedy so much of a popular favorite, that we are bound to infer that his State Rights views were but hollow professions? Mr. Jefferson, it is true, had sanctioned the doctrine, in language as explicit as any used by Mr. Calhoun—declaring, expressly, “that in all cases of an abuse of delegated powers, the members of the General Government being chosen by the people, a change by the people would be the constitutional remedy; but, where powers are assumed which have not been delegated, a nullification of the act is the rightful remedy; that every State has a natural right, in cases not in the compact, to nullify, of their own authority, all assumptions of powers within their limits.”

Mr. Jefferson had said, further, in his letter to Mr. Cartwright, of England: “With respect to our State and Federal Governments, I do not think their relations are correctly understood by foreigners. They suppose the former are subordinate to the latter. This is not the case. They are co-ordinate departments of one simple and integral whole. But you may ask, if the two departments should claim each the same subject of power, where is the umpire to decide between them? In cases of little urgency or importance, the prudence of both parties will keep them aloof from the questionable ground, but, if it can neither be avoided nor compromised, a convention of the States must be called, to ascribe the doubtful power to that department which they may think best.”

But though Mr. Jefferson had gone, to the full, as far in this doctrine as Mr. Calhoun ever did, and yet was hailed as the great apostle of liberty, and peculiarly the light of Democracy, still it is well known that, at the time Mr. Calhoun took the ground in its support, nullification was considered but another name for treason, and a nullifier shunned like a leper. Was it any time-serving motive which induced him, with but a fragment of the South to sustain him, to brave in this cause, the administration of General Jackson, in the plenitude of its power—united, as it was on this issue, with the whole opposition party of the Eastern, Western, and Middle States? Did he differ with Gen. Jackson’s administration during a period of weakness, when its speedy overthrow might have promised a reward for his efforts? It is well known that never was administration so strong before in the history of our Government. Or did he re-unite himself to his old friends of the democracy in an hour of victory and triumph? It was in their extremest peril, when the darkness of all without afforded no ray to cheer them on their way, and there was nothing to sustain them but an abiding confidence in the mightiness of truth.

Talk of treachery and Calhoun together! Whom did he ever betray? Did he, during the war betray his country? Do we find him burning blue lights to guide her enemies’ vessels into her har-

bors? or declaring it sinful to rejoice in her victories, while he sang "hosannas" to the triumphs of her foe?

As to his temporary difference with the Jackson party, it must be remembered that he joined their ranks as a free-trade man. And when General Jackson went into office, it was well known that South Carolina looked to State interposition as the ultimate remedy, unless the protective policy was abandoned. He but followed out what he was already pledged to. He never broke faith with any one. And as to his separation from the Whigs,—Mr. Calhoun never did belong to their party. He was among them, but not one of them. He repeatedly declared, from his place in the Senate, that his was not a systematic opposition; and he openly repudiated the name of Whig, when Mr. Clay applied it in a way which was intended to include him. He never joined in their political meetings or party consultations. How, then, charge him with desertion!

Mr. Calhoun has, it is true, on many occasions, exercised the independence of differing with his party upon certain questions. But this fact will be observed in almost every instance: where he has done so, time has afterwards brought the party to sanction his course, and condemn their own. He differed with his party upon the effects of the embargo and restrictive system, as a substitute for war. The system was shortly after abandoned; war was declared; and his views are now disputed by nobody. He differed with his party upon Mr. Dallas's project of a non-specie-paying bank, with a capital of \$50,000,000; and, by his vigorous and preserving opposition, he defeated the measure. He had, in a few short months, the satisfaction of receiving the thanks of many who, at the time, were indignant at his opposition. He differed from his party in opposing the power given to President Madison, of transferring appropriations from one branch of service to another in the War and Navy Departments; and what Democrat now doubts that he was right? He took decided ground against a tariff of protection, while as yet it was not considered a necessary part of the Democratic faith. The party has since sanctioned this course. Whether the party will, at any future period, sanction his difference of opinion on the subject of State interposition, time only can determine. The great body of the Democratic party then agreed with Jackson, Livingston, and other distinguished leaders, in considering it as a dangerous heresy, which might lead to most disastrous political consequences. The doctrine is still condemned by the majority of the party; but since it has ceased to be a practical question, and all excitement has been allayed, it is admitted that it was, in the abstract, sanctioned by Mr. Jefferson, and other Democrats of old; and as a matter about which there may very well exist an honest difference of opinion. He

differed with the Democratic party upon the propriety of removing the deposits from the United States Bank to a set of State and joint-stock banks, contending that the only proper alternative to the former was a divorce between Government and all banks; a return to the "strong box." And he sanctioned, when the Democratic party opposed them, the Sub-treasury resolutions introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. Gordon, of Virginia. The party are now, on these points, unanimously with Mr. Calhoun. He differed again from the party on a memorable occasion. At the extra session of 1837, the Committee of Finance reported a bill for the establishment of what was called the "sub-treasury," but without providing for the collection of the revenues in gold and silver. Mr. Calhoun rose; and, incurring on the one hand the most rancorous hostility of the Whigs, by advocating the general principles of the bill, he on the other hand, alone and unaided, denounced the bill itself, in the strongest terms, as a perfect abortion, deprived of all vitality, by the omission of what was termed, at the time, the "*specie clause*"—declaring that if that was what was meant by a sub-treasury, he washed his hands of all concern with it. The party has since, to the fullest extent, ratified his judgment. But whether his differences with the party have been wise, or unwise, we repeat that no right judging man can doubt that they were honest. What stronger proof of honesty than that leading a politician's life, and ambitious, (as we admit him to be,) he should never once have descended to the petty arts of the demagogue? Washington himself was not more free from these than this illustrious statesman. Nowhere do you find, in all his writings, in his speeches, or in his conduct, an appeal to popular prejudice and passion. He seems ever to hold the language happily applied to another great Carolinian—"I stand by, and let *Reason* speak for me."

We have all heard the pretty anecdote of Mr. Clay and the Kentucky hunter, his constituent, on the subject of his vote on the compensation bill—of his calling on the old leather-stocking not to break his well-tried rifle because it had once snapped, but to "pick the flint, and try it again." Mr. Calhoun voted for the same bill; his friends at home fell off; he met with violent opposition; and he, too, was called on to apologize, and beg that his constituents would "pick the flint, and try him again." He refused to apologize for what he considered as right, and vindicated his vote by argument before the people; and he, as well as Mr. Clay, was re-elected.

Who can seriously fear that John C. Calhoun will, if elected, fail to carry out the principles he professes? What his principles are, we are at no loss to discern. The volume put forth by the Harpers contains them, written as with a sunbeam. We may ap-

ply to all his speeches the language which William Pinckney, of Maryland, applied to one of them—"The strong power of genius, from a higher region than that of argument, has thrown on the subjects of which he treats all the light with which it is the prerogative of genius to invest and illustrate every thing."

We would like to know, by the way, for what reason it is that the Whig press is so indignantly clamorous against the "suppression" (as they term it) of a portion of Mr. Calhoun's speeches.

Do the Whigs believe that Mr. Calhoun, if elected to the Presidency, would act upon the principles contained in the "unpublished speeches," rather than those avowed in the published volume? And if so, and those speeches really contain good Whig doctrine, as they say, why should they be distressed? Are they charitably interposing to save the Democratic party from their fate in the elevation of Mr. Tyler? The Democrats are infinitely grateful, but we take it upon ourselves to assure these charitable Whigs that, whoever may be nominee of the party, he will stand pledged, explicitly and unequivocally, to such principles as they expect him to act on if elected. Whatever of Whig doctrine, however, the Whigs can find in Mr. Calhoun's speeches, they do well to publish, as a sort of antidote to Mr. Clay's speech against a United States Bank.

Very many of the alleged inconsistencies of Mr. Calhoun (in fact all, charged on him since the beginning of the second epoch of his political life—viz: his election to the Vice Presidency in 1824) are such only in appearance, and are susceptible of easy explanation. We will not, however, encumber this article with anything further on this point. A careful perusal of the volume of his speeches, just issued by the Harpers, will afford his best vindication.

MR. CALHOUN—HIS CAPABILITY.

NO. II.

Having concluded, in our first number, what we had to say in regard to Mr. Calhoun's principles and character, we propose, in the present, to add, in further connection with the ground of fitness for the nomination as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, a few remarks as to his capabilities. If his principles are unexceptionable to the party, his honesty above suspicion, and his steadiness of purpose worthy of all reliance, the only remaining consideration is his capacity for giving to those principles a practical application.

No statesman in America (except, perhaps, Mr. Webster) has his position, as to pure intellect, so universally conceded, as Mr. Calhoun. He is not merely a man of talents and ability, but he

... emphatically a man of genius—one who originates, and who must, more or less, leave his impress on the age in which he lives. He is not to be considered merely, or even mainly, in so far as he immediately influences others. Each speech of his inspires, suggests, or gives material for hundreds of other speeches; some of which, for general effect, may be superior to the original. Trace to their source all the new ideas and new arguments which have been advanced for the last sixteen years, elucidating the principles of free trade, the currency, or the peculiar relations of our State and Federal Governments, and, still more, the grand fundamental principles of all governments,—and the portion assignable either directly or indirectly to Mr. Calhoun, would be a matter of curiosity and astonishment. How often do we find in his speeches an important truth contained in some single pithy sentence, passing unnoticed at the time, which, by the progress of events, in years long after, is brought prominently forth, and made the turning point of controversy! It is only a succeeding generation which can do full justice to his efforts.

We are very far from contending that genius is a necessary requisite in fulfilling well the duties of the chief executive office of the United States. Genius, indeed, is so frequently merely speculative, that, unless it has been tested, and, by actual experiment, found to be connected with practical ability, we could scarce venture to urge it as even a recommendation. That it may, however, be so connected, no one who reads history can doubt. Indeed, to the highest practical ability, genius, or the creative faculty, is essential. Hannibal, Julius Cæsar, the Czar Peter, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon, were as unquestionably possessed of genius as Homer, Plato, or Aristotle, Newton, Bacon, or Milton.

Mr. Calhoun has been called "visionary," "metaphysical," and "abstract;" by which it is meant that he is deficient in good sense, sound judgment, and executive ability. Wherein, we would ask, has this deficiency shown itself? When, at the age of fourteen, his education—then, indeed, but just begun—was interrupted, he is found sedulously and cheerfully devoting himself to the business of his father's farm, relieving his labors, with the appropriate rural recreations of hunting and fishing. After four years thus contentedly passed, it was urged upon him to choose one of the learned professions; to which he consented, only on condition that his little property could be so managed as to allow him to pursue a preparatory course of seven years study. The arrangement was made; and his resolution rigidly adhered to. He succeeded well in college, as he had before done on his farm. He succeeded well in the practice of law, as long as he continued in that profession. How well he succeeded in Congress, it is unnecessary to speak; and this not only as a debater, but upon the important committees

on which he served. He has, throughout a political career of now thirty-two years, maintained, without a moment's diminution, the confidence of his native State. During a long life he has been invariably esteemed and beloved, in proportion as he has been known. And absorbed, as it would appear he must have been, in public duties, his very moderate private property has been preserved undiminished and unembarrassed. Call you this man "visionary" and impracticable?

But, fortunately, we are not left to conjecture, inference, or analogy, in judging of the administrative talent of Mr. Calhoun as a statesman. His administration of the War Department afforded ample demonstration. It is true that he introduced there changes, which the routine-men of that day pronounced visionary, wild, and impracticable. His system of bureaus was thus denounced, and it was with difficulty that he overcame the violence of the opposition. This wild and visionary measure, however, has stood the test of twenty-five years experience, and remains, through all the visitudes of party, to this day unchanged, and an admitted improvement. When he took charge of the department, it was literally without any organization, and every thing appertaining to it in apparently inextricable confusion. In a very few months a complete organization was established, regulated by an entire new code of rules, and the whole working in perfect harmony. And for the seven years of his administration of it, it continued as completely arranged and efficient a military establishment as any of its size in the world.

He found the unsettled accounts of the Department running back (many of them) almost to the origin of the Government, amounting to upwards of \$10,000,000. These he reduced to less than \$3,000,000. Of \$1,571,961 drawn in 1822 by the Department, which passed through 291 disbursing officers, not one cent was lost to the Government—not one defalcation occurred. He found the army proper costing \$151 per man, and he left the cost per man \$287. The gross annual saving, during his administration of the department, out of an expenditure of \$4,000,000, was about \$1,300,000. And yet, with the army, and all connected with the department, Mr. Calhoun maintained an unexampled popularity throughout all his reforms.

And this is the man whom it is attempted to represent as a mere dealer in abstractions—a skilful skirmisher in scholastic subtleties! Very different was General Bernard's estimate of Mr. Calhoun.—This favorite aid-de-camp of the French Emperor, who, as chief of the United States Engineer Department, had the means of knowing Mr. Calhoun intimately, often declared that his extraordinary administrative talent constantly reminded him of his beloved chief—the great Napoleon.

The truth is, that to pronounce Mr. Calhoun deficient in practical ability, is to oppose mere gratuitous assertion to an unbroken series of facts; spread throughout a long life; which, at each step we take, stamps the assumption with impudence and falsehood.

We cannot think that we are doing injustice to the other very able and distinguished Democrats whose names have been presented, with Mr. Calhoun's in connexion with the Presidency, when we declare that, in point of peculiar fitness for the office, Mr. Calhoun has something the advantage of any other individual. Great as are the acknowledged abilities of the other gentlemen named, something more in the way of retrenchment, reform, and improved organization of the various departments of Government, might be expected from Mr. Calhoun than from any one else. In our view, he is pre-eminently the man for the crisis.

JOHN C. CALHOUN AND GEO. McDUFFIE.

We extract the following from a Life of Mr. Calhoun recently published at the New World office (New York) under the superintendence of the Calhoun General Committee of New York city.

"Mr. Calhoun has never been poor or rich—he has always been independent in his resources; and while many public men have, by devotion to public affairs, let their private matters fall into embarrassment, Mr. Calhoun has always acted upon those maxims in private life that he has advocated in his official stations; that is, freedom from debt, strict accountability, and reduction of expenses within the legitimate sources of revenue. He was never one of those kind of men to preach one doctrine and practice another. What he professes in public life, he practices in his daily private walks. He always desires his acts, public and private, to speak for themselves; and shuns public exhibitions of himself, and public declamation for electioneering purposes—stating he considers the *OFFICE of President of the United States* of too high and dignified a character to be sought at the hands of the people by way of stump speeches and electioneering tours; and that, as it is the highest office in the gift of the people, they should be left free to make their own unbiassed choice of a Chief Magistrate.

Although Mr. Calhoun is not poor or rich, he has always been liberal in dispensing aid to others in distress and need. But his charities have been so privately bestowed that they never came to light, unless divulged by those who have participated in his bounty. He has always shown a deep interest in the education and advancement of young men. It is well known that the celebrated *George McDuffie* was born of obscure and poor parents, inhabiting a log hut in the pine woods of Georgia. When quite a lad, he strayed to

Augusta, where he entered a retail store as a clerk. Here he was seen by a brother of John C. Calhoun, who had gone to Augusta with his wagon from Abbeville. On conversing with the lad, he formed so favorable an opinion of his understanding that he invited him to go home with him, and promised to use his influence in getting him placed in a more advantageous situation. On their return to Carolina, Patrick Calhoun, the brother, introduced young McDuffie to John C., who also formed so high an estimate of the young man's abilities, that he at once proposed to place him at the Academy of his brother-in-law, where he accordingly went at his expense. While here, he made the most rapid progress, and soon qualified himself to enter the South Carolina College at Columbia. Here he also prosecuted his studies with distinguished success, at Mr. Calhoun's expense. He afterward studied law, and became, as we all know, a distinguished man. On one occasion, Mr. McDuffie, with Judge Huger, the present U. S. Senator from South Carolina, were both members of the State Legislature. The subject of an appropriation to the State College at Columbia came up for discussion. It was opposed by some members from the upper counties of the State, on the ground that it had never done any good, and was only open to the sons of the rich, &c. Judge Huger rose in reply, and stated, "If the College had never educated but one man, and that man was George McDuffie, it deserved all the money the State has ever bestowed upon it."

When the judge took his seat, Mr. McDuffie, rose, and said he felt deeply sensible of the compliment which had been paid him: and however much he was indebted to that institution for his education, and however much he might owe to it for the little distinction he had gained in public life, he wished the honor of his education place where it belonged. Whatever degree of usefulness his exertions had fulfilled, or whatever honor might await him in future life, it was all due to Mr. Calhoun. It was he who had educated him at his own expense, and to him he wished all the honor awarded."

MR. CALHOUN.

Mr. Calhoun's recent speech in defence of himself against the attacks of Mr. Clay is precisely on the plan of the famous oration *De Corona*, delivered by the great Athenian, in vindication of himself from the elaborate and artful attacks of Æschines. While the one says—"Athenians! to you I appeal, my judges and my witnesses!"—the other says: "In proof of this, I appeal to you, Senators, my witnesses and my judges on this occasion!" Æschines accused Demosthenes of having received a bribe from Philip, and the latter retorted by saying that the other had accused him of do-

ing what he himself had notoriously done. Mr. Clay says, that Mr. Calhoun had gone over, and he left to time to disclose his motives. Mr. Calhoun retorts: "Leave it to time to disclose my motives for going over! I, who have changed no opinion, abandoned no principle, and deserted no party—I, who have stood still and maintained my ground against every difficulty, to be told that it is left to time to disclose my motive! The imputation sinks to the earth with the groundless charge on which he it rests. I stamp it down in the dust. I pick up the dart which fell harmless at my feet. I hurl it back. What the Senator charges on me unjustly, he *has actually done*. He went over on a memorable occasion, and *did not* leave it to time to disclose his motive." In the conception and arrangement of the whole speech, in fact, there is a remarkable similarity to the speech of the great Athenian. And where could any man find a nobler model? For withering sarcasm—burning invective—lofty declamation—for all that is spirit-stirring and glorious in eloquence, there is not on record, in any language, as noble and perfect a specimen as this oration for the crown.

THE PRESIDENTIAL QUESTION.

"Whom the gods intend to destroy they first make mad."

Every moment but adds to our conviction, of the absolute necessity of harmony in the ranks of the Democratic party, while every mail brings us proof, that this harmony is in imminent peril of being destroyed. It is impossible to read the *Globe* or *Richmond Enquirer* without being convinced that they have placed themselves on a ground, from which they cannot be driven, to support any candidate but one of their own choosing. Other presses, with different views, are equally out of the pale of party organization. The recklessness of the *Globe* in denouncing every Democrat who may have received office under President Tyler, looks as much like insanity as any thing we have lately seen in politics.—Such intestine divisions and household contests as now infest us cannot be put down without the strongest reprobation, and decided rebuke of the press.

We have long since shown our opinion. We are decidedly in favor of allowing a seat in the Baltimore Convention to every man who is sent by the Democratic party of his State—and to the Convention, the regulation of its own affairs, such as the powers of the delegates sent from each State, mode of voting, &c. If a Convention, thus organized, shall decide the question, who is to be the candidates of the Democratic party, we shall support their nominations with great satisfaction. If, on the contrary, the confusion now manifest in the public press, invades the Baltimore Convention, and we are thrown off, to wage a guerilla warfare, every one on his own hill we pretend not to foresee the result, or to define our own position in that dark hour.—*Milledgeville (Geo.) Union*.

L. of C.

THE RICH RICHER, AND THE POOR POORER.

As an evidence of the benefits of a Protective Tariff, we are informed by the Boston papers, that all the factory stocks have advanced one half in value. This is good for the rich capitalists.

But, on the other hand, the same papers inform us that the mechanics are striking for wages, and that even the poor seamstresses are endeavoring to wring from their employers an additional pittance—as at their present wages they are not able by hard labor to earn more than ten cents per day. This is bad for the poor operative.

Thus is exemplified, in a limited circle, the working of the Protective system. While it increases the wealth of those already affluent, it grinds the faces of the poor to the very earth. If persevered in, it will not be long ere the condition of our laboring population will be assimilated to that of the operatives in the English factories, and the wealth of our country be concentrated in the hands of the spinning-jenny nobility.

The talented Editor of the *New World* (a periodical devoted to polite literature) thus hits off the political minnows who nibble at Mr. Calhoun's great name: Had the editor been acquainted with the character of those who hereabouts have made the charge of inconsistency against Mr. Calhoun, and their puny attacks, he could not more aptly have delineated both. The extract I send is taken from the *New World* of the 12th October.

Mr. Calhoun's Consistency.—We observe that several 'mousing politicians' are denouncing Mr. Calhoun for want of consistency, because his opinion on certain political questions have undergone some change during the last thirty years. The charge is supremely ridiculous, and can have no influence whatever upon intelligent minds. To suppose that, during the long public life of the distinguished statesman, his opinions had remained the same, would, in fact, be to suppose that he made no intellectual advancement. In love of country and manly patriotism, in his moral and religious character, Mr. Calhoun has been perfectly consistent. We don't write this paragraph as political partisans, for any particular purpose, but simply to expose the folly of the charge of 'inconsistency' so frequently and so foolishly brought against public men.—We commend the following fine sentiment of Cowley to the puny assailants of Mr. Calhoun:

"Where honor or where conscience does not bind,
No other shall shackle me;
Slave to myself I will not be,
Nor shall my future actions be confined
To my own present mind."

[*Independent Democrat.*

THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

The doctrine of protection avowed by the Syracuse Convention, meets with no favor at the hands of the Southern Democracy.—At a recent meeting of the Democratic party of Greene county, Alabama, the following resolution was unanimously adopted :

Resolved, That the theory of protection put forth by the Syracuse Convention, forms no part of the Republican creed : we regard our Government as instituted for the benefit of the whole people, and whenever its powers are directed—either directly, or under the hypocritical guise of protection “*to agriculture, commerce and manufactures*”—to the advancement of sectional interest, it departs from the cardinal principle upon which it is founded, and such departure necessarily implies a nullity of constitutional power.

PROTECTION.

The fundamental doctrine of this system, is that it is better for a nation to make all the articles its inhabitants want, than it is to make other things and exchange for what they want. Trading is the injurious thing, especially with foreign nations. The doctrine of free trade is, that it is best for every man to obtain what he wants with the least possible amount of labor and expense, and that each man is the proper judge in his own case. Protection says in substance, if you want a coat you ought to make it : free trade says, if you can get it easier by making something else and exchanging it for a coat, do so, if you please. Here is really the whole matter in controversy, though the protectionists never like these short statements.—*Journal of Commerce*.

THE COCK AND THE COON.

A Western paper gives the following good one, upon these emblems of parties in those diggins :

These have now by common consent become the ensign or coat of arms of the two leading parties of the day.

The Democratic papers announce almost every victory under the figure of the crowning rooster. We had doubtless some share ourselves, unintentionally, however, of introducing this bird as the emblem of Democracy when we wrote to Chapman to *crow*. Indeed, the cock is the appropriate emblem of Democracy. Brave, vigilant, and sprightly, he is always on the watch. So soon as the sun, like a great loco match, lightens up the world and scatters the darkness of night, the cock salutes him with his well known cry of *loco fo CO!* He is faithful and constant in his attachments, and loathes traitors, or those who forsake their friends. When St.

Peter, like a Whig, failed to redeem the promise he had made, the cock reprimanded him three times. And throughout the Union the Democratic cock is reprimanding the Whigs for failing to redeem their promise of good times—"two dollars a day and roast beef."

The coon, or Whig ensign, is a nocturnal animal. He prowls about in the dark, and dreads the light. The blaze of a loco loco match starts him off in alarm. He sneaks from henroost to henroost, like a Whig from bank to bank on borrowed capital. At cock crowing he puts off like an evil spirit to his murky den."

WHO SHALL DECIDE?

Mr. Webster, in the speech which he made before the agriculturists of Rochester, was pleased to remark:

"I do say, gentlemen, that the agriculture of this country is the great matter which demands protection. It is a misnomer to talk about the protection of manufacture; that is not the thing we want or need; it is the protection of the agriculture of the country!" [Repeated cheers.]

Not a few weeks before this was stated, Mr. Clay, writing to the Editors of the Tennessee Agricultural Journal, was also pleased to remark:

"Owing to the peculiar position of the United States, agriculture requires but little protection, and that confined to a few branches of it. It is otherwise with the other two interests. They require some protection against the selfish legislation and the rivalry of foreign powers," &c.

Either one or the other of these learned Doctors must be wrong, and we should like to be informed, by some of their admirers, which one of the two is to be believed. As a high authority has nominated the gentlemen to run respectively as the Whig candidates for the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency, perhaps they intend, as in the campaign of 1840, to adapt themselves to all classes of opinion.—*New York Evening Post*.

**VALUABLE BOOKS,
FOR SALE BY N. HICKMAN,
88 BALTIMORE St.
BALTIMORE.**

Calhoun's Speeches.

Selection from the Speeches, Reports, and other Writings of John C. Calhoun, subsequent to his Election as Vice-President of the United States: including his leading Speech on the late War, delivered in 1811. Presenting a condensed History of Political Events from 1811 to 1843. 8vo, Price \$1 00

Life of John C. Calhoun.

Presenting a Condensed History of Political Events from 1811 to 1843. 8vo. Price 12½ Cents.

Kendall's Life of General Jackson.

The Life of General Andrew Jackson. By the Hon. Amos Kendall. To be completed in Fifteen Numbers, at Twenty-five Cents each, illustrated with Engravings or Prints, averaging two to a Number, embracing Likenesses of the General, and some of his most distinguished co-actors, Drawings of his Battle-grounds, &c.

Prescott's Conquest of Mexico.

The History of the Conquest of Mexico, with the Life of the Conqueror, Hernando Cortes, and a View of the Ancient Mexican Civilization. In three Volumes, 8vo., with Portraits and Maps.

Alison's History of Europe,

During the French Revolution, from 1789 to 1815. Complete in 16 Numbers, at 25 Cents each, or in 4 vols. octavo of about 600 pages each. In various styles of bindings.

Thiers' History of the French Revolution.

With Illustrative Notes, &c., by Frederick Shoberl. Embellished with 13 Engravings. Complete in 4 vols. 8vo. Price \$5 00.

Watson on the Prayer Book.

The Prayer Book a Safe Guide, or the Devout Churchman's Way of Faith and Practice. Lectures delivered at St. John's Church, Cheltenham, during Lent 1843, by the Rev. Alexander Watson, M. A. (Curate of the Church) 1 vol. 12 mo., 270 pages. Price 50 Cents.

This work has been favorably reviewed and cordially recommended by all the Protestant Episcopal Journals throughout the United States.

Murray's Geography.

The Encyclopedia of Geography, comprising a complete description of the Earth, Physical, Statistical, Civil and Political, by Hugh Murray. Illustrated by 82 Maps and 1100 Engravings. New edition, revised by D. G. Bradford. 3 vols. 8vo.

THE POLITICIAN'S REGISTER,

In Press and will be Published Shortly,

THE POLITICIAN'S REGISTER, containing a List of the Chief Executive and Judicial Officers of the United States. The members of the 28th Congress, Governors of the States and Territories, with their Terms of office, Salaries &c. The time of holding Elections and place and time of the meeting of the State Legislatures, the Census of 1840, with the number of Presidential Electors and Congressmen under the new apportionment act, a digest of the Naturalization Laws. Together with the votes polled for President, Governors, Congressmen, &c. in the several States by counties in 1840, 41, 42, & 43.

SECOND EDITION,

Containing all the Elections of 1843, 1 vol. 18 mo. 72 pages. Price 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cts. or \$1.25 cts a dozen.

ALSO,

THE ASHLAND TEXT BOOK,

Containing Various Extracts from the Speeches of the Hon. Henry Clay, articles on the Protection of American Industry. With a sketch of the Life of the Hon. Henry Clay, Various Statistical Matters, Bon Mots, &c. Compiled by an "Experienced Writer," embellished with a Portrait of "Harry of the West," 1 vol. 12 mo. 60 pages, Price 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cts.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 838 186 5